DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 344 EC 004 697

TITLE	A Report of the 1969 Introductory and Advanced Institutes in Programed Instruction and Instructional Systems for Teachers of the Deaf.
INSTITUTION	New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces. Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Captioned Films for the Deaf Branch.
PUB DATE	69
CONTRACT	OEC-4-7000183-0183
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.55
DESCRIPTORS	*Aurally Handicapped, *Exceptional Child Education, Program Descriptions, *Programed Instruction, *Program Evaluation, *Summer Institutes, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Education, Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

To provide participants with intensive training in programed instruction, to make them more knowledgeable consumers of programed instruction materials, and to develop programming skills on a professional level so that they could apply the systems approach in development of instructional materials, two training institutes were initiated. A total of 44 teachers of the deaf participated in the institutes which lasted 5 weeks each during the summers of 1968 and 1969. Included are the calendar of events, the instructional program log, programmed instructional material developed by the institutes, administrative details, social activities, and evaluations. The overall evaluation was that the institutes were well designed and helpful; a complete breakdown of evaluated areas is provided. Also presented are summaries of the evaluations, the instructor evaluation form, the consultant evaluation form, recommendations, and a roster and photograph of staff, instructors, and participants. (JM)

ED034344

A REPORT OF THE

1969

INTRODUCTORY AND ADVANCED INSTITUTES

IN PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION AND

INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS

FOR TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

SOUTHWEST REGIONAL MEDIA CENTER FOR THE DEAF

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO

JUNE 30 - AUGUST 8, 1969

SPONSORED BY

MEDIA SERVICES AND CAPTIONED FILMS

BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CONTRACT NO. OEC4-7000183-0183

ED004912

ED034344

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A REPORT OF THE

1969

INTRODUCTORY AND ADVANCED INSTITUTES

IN PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION AND

INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS

FOR TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

SOUTHWEST REGIONAL MEDIA CENTER FOR THE DEAF

NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY

LAS CRUCES, NEW MEXICO

JUNE 30 - AUGUST 8, 1969

SPONSORED BY

MEDIA SERVICES AND CAPTIONED FILMS

BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CONTRACT NO. OEC4-7000183-0183

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Acknowledgements 3

Objectives of Institutes 4

Instructional Staff and Guest Lecturers 5

Instructional Programs 8

1. Institute Calendar 9
2. Introductory and Advanced Institutes Instructional Program Log 10
3. Programed Instructional Material Developed by 1968 and 1969 Institutes 16

Administrative Procedures 19

Social Activities 21

Evaluation 22

1. Summary of Participants Evaluation of Institute at End of Third Week

a. Introductory Institute 23
b. Advanced Institute 24

2. Summary of Final Institute Evaluation by Participants 25

3. Instructor Evaluation Form 35

4. Consultant Evaluation Form 36

Recommendations 38

Roster and Addresses of Staff, Instructors and Participants 40

Photograph - Staff, Instructors and Participants 43

Geographic Distribution of 1968 and 1969 Institutes 44

INTRODUCTION

The 1969 Institutes in Programed Instruction and Instructional Systems conducted for teachers of the deaf are an integral part of the Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf total program, which is an expression of the Center's committment to encourage innovation in educational practice in schools and programs for the deaf.

Programed Instruction and the Instructional Systems Approach are two compatible processes which have been derived from separate sources, the psychological laboratory on the one hand and the engineering sciences on the other. When viewed in terms of process, they appear to have a great deal in common.

While programed instruction is the main emphasis of our institutes, it is our hope that participants will come to see the programing process as being applicable to a wide variety of materials and activities. We hope that they will find it is a process for systematically developing materials which will effectively accomplish specific objectives that are integrally related to larger and hopefully well defined educational goals capable of guiding the development of the larger instructional system.

One of the important values of programed instruction is its potential as an efficient method of instruction. When we have techniques for providing effective instruction in an efficient manner, we will be forced to recognize their implications for general practice. When should we teach what to whom--and how? Since

the programing process is empirical in nature, we should be better able to answer such questions.

In a day when educators of deaf children are increasingly recognizing the need to increase their effectiveness, it is appropriate that the empirical techniques developed in programed instruction and the instructional systems approach be recognized as possible answers to some of the problems which we face in providing maximum opportunity for deaf students to achieve at a level more closely commensurate with their capacities.

The Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf staff is pleased to have a part in the process of innovation which we optimistically believe will result eventually in greater opportunity for accomplishment by deaf individuals.

It is appropriate to express our appreciation for the guidance, encouragement and financial support of Media Services and Captioned Films, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education, which has made these institutes and other services of the Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf possible.

Hubert D. Summers, Assistant Director
Southwest Regional Media Center for
the Deaf

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their interest, and support in making the institute a success, the Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf would like to express its appreciation to Dr. H. E. Charles, Superintendent, El Paso School District, Dr. James S. Nicholl, Director of Special Education, and Mrs. Virginia Ingersol, Supervisor of the El Paso County-Wide School for the Deaf; Dr. Jack O. L. Saunders, Dean, and Dr. Donald G. Ferguson, Assistant Dean, College of Education, New Mexico State University and Dr. Gilbert L. Delgado, Chief, Media Services and Captioned Films, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education.

We also gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the members of the selection committee composed of: Dr. Roy Stelle, Superintendent, New York School for the Deaf, White Plains, New York; Mr. Rance Henderson, Director, West Suburban Association for the Hearing Handicapped, Lyons, Illinois; Miss Gladys Fish, Principal, Bruce Street School, Newark, New Jersey; Mr. Myron Leenhouts, Assistant Superintendent, California School for the Deaf, Berkeley, California.

OBJECTIVES OF INSTITUTES

Introductory Institute

The goal of the Introductory Institute was to provide the participants with short-term intensive training in programed instruction; to make them more sophisticated consumers of programed instructional materials.

Specific objectives of this institute were to enable participants to:

1. gain knowledge of learning theory and operant conditioning as they relate to programed instruction;
2. learn basic concepts of programing;
3. plan and develop programed materials under supervision;
4. acquire basic skills in developmental testing of materials with deaf students;
5. gain knowledge of procedures used in evaluating programed material;
6. enrich their experience in the application of innovative educational technology;
7. gain knowledge of applications of the instructional systems approach.

Advanced Institute

The majority of participants in the Advanced Institute attended the Introductory Institute the previous year. The other participants had prior experience in the use and development of programed materials.

For this institute, the goals were to provide the opportunity for participants to develop programing skills that would approximate a professional level and to apply the systems approach in development of instructional materials.

Specific objectives of the Advanced Institute were to enable participants to:

1. develop and refine skills in instructional program writing;
2. develop testing skills in developmental materials;
3. design instructional flow charts and matrices;
4. understand the systems approach as it applies to instructional development;
5. supervise the use and development of programed materials in their schools.

Instructors

Bernard Basescu, free-lance programer, holds a B.A. degree from New York University, and a M.A. degree from Columbia University. He was editor, trainer, and consultant in programed materials for the Center for Programed Instruction in New York City. In 1967 and 1968 he was a research associate at the Institute for Educational Technology, Teachers College, Columbia University. At that time he also served as a consultant to Performance Systems Incorporated, programing materials for the Job Corps. He was an instructor in the first Institute on Programed Instruction and Instructional Systems for the Deaf, at New Mexico State University. His published articles include those appearing in Programed Instruction, Prospectives in Programing and Automated Education Handbook.

Arthur Babick, Ph.D. is presently Assistant Professor of Education in the School of Education and Research Associate in the Audio-Visual Research Department at Indiana University, Bloomington. He has held this position at Indiana University since 1967. Prior to that, he was Research Associate at Syracuse University and Director of Learning Aids Center at Goddard College. His publications have been in such journals as: New England Association Review, The American Journal of Psychology and Media In Higher Education.

James D. Russell is presently Research Associate and Program Supervisor for the Division of Instructional Media Learning Systems Technology Program at the University of Indiana, Bloomington. Prior to his present position, he was an instructor in the Physics Department, Wittenberg University. He is co-author of publications, expected to be available in the spring of 1970, in the areas of programed instruction and science instruction methods.

Guest Lecturers

Dr. Philip W. Tieman, Head
Course Development Division
Office of Instructional Resources
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois

Topics: "Really Understanding Concepts"
"Developing Specific Instructional Objectives"

Dr. Susan M. Markle, Head
Programed Instruction
Office of Instructional Resources
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois

Topics: "The Analysis of Concepts"
"The Analysis of Student Problems"

Guest Lecturers, continued

Dr. Glenn S. Pfau, Assistant Director
Project LIFE
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Topics: "Introduction to Project LIFE"
"Review of Research in Deaf Education"
"Programed Instructional System Characteristics"

Mrs. Hilda Williams, Language Coordinator
Project LIFE
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.

Topic: "Language Development in the Deaf"

Dr. Phillip Harris, Research Associate
Department of Psychology
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Topics: "Programed Tutoring"
"Response Analysis Systems"

Dr. Ross E. Stuckless, Director
Research and Training
Rochester Institute of Technology
National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester, New York

Topic: "Individually Prescribed Instruction
for Deaf Students - Some Whys and Hows"

Dr. Samuel Postlethwait, Professor
Department of Biological Science
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

Topic: "A Systems Approach Using Mediated Instruction"

Guest Lecturers, continued

Dr. Lawrence Stolurow, Director
Computer-Aided Instruction Laboratory
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Topics: "Implications of the Psychology of Transfer for Instructional Engineering"
"The Organization of Learning Experiences"

Dr. Sivasailam Thiagarajan, Research Associate
Audio-Visual Research
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Topics: "The Human Element in Instructional Systems"
"Development of an Operational Program"

Mr. Kay Rigg, Assistant Director
Communications Research Laboratory
Department of Speech
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Topic: "Contingency Management"

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

Introductory Institute

The instructional program was conducted by Mr. Bernard Basescu. Mr. James Russell assisted with instructional tasks under Mr. Basescu's direction. Guest lecturers provided insights into special applications of the programing process.

Supplementing the instructional program were opportunities to examine and evaluate a wide selection of commercial programs. Thirty-one teachers of the deaf participated in this institute; one without the benefit of a stipend.

Classes met Monday through Friday from 8:00 - 12:00 and 1:30 - 4:30. On the days selected participants traveled to El Paso,their daily schedule was 7:30 - 1:00 and 2:00 - 5:00.

Advanced Institute

Dr. Arthur Babick conducted the instructional activities of the Advanced Institute with the assistance of Mr. James Russell. Mr. Russell provided coordination between the instructional activities of Dr. Babick and Mr. Basescu as necessary. Guest lecturers were also provided. Thirteen teachers of the deaf participated in the institute, one without benefit of a stipend.

Classes met Monday through Friday from 8:00 - 12:00 and 1:30 - 4:30. On the days selected participants traveled to El Paso, their daily schedule was 7:30 - 1:00 and 2:00 - 5:00.

Guest Lecturers

Enhancing the instructional programs of the two institutes, presentations were made by outstanding guest lecturers. Their topics dealt with many facets of innovative educational technology. The consultants provided added insight into the practical applications and the potential of programed instruction. The two institutes were combined for guest lecturer presentations.

Developmental Testing in El Paso

In addition to the instructional activities on the NMSU campus, developmental testing of materials was conducted under the supervision of the institute instructors at the Hillside School in El Paso, Texas. Institute participants were transported as required

in the second through the fifth week of the session. The children were made available through institute funds and supervised by personnel of the El Paso School District. This opportunity was afforded by the excellent cooperation of the administration and special education personnel of the El Paso School District.

INSTITUTE CALENDAR

JULY

MON	TUE	WED	TH	FRI
June 30 Registration and Orientation	1	2 Drs. Tieman and Markle Dr. Delgado	3	4
7	* 8	* 9	* 10 Dr. Pfau Mrs. Williams	* 11 Dr. Pfau Mrs. Williams
14 Dr. Harris	* 15	* 16	* 17	* 18 Dr. Stuckless
21	* 22	* 23	* 24 Dr. Postlethwait	* 25 Dr. Postlethwait
28	* 29 Dr. Stolurow	* 30	* 31 Mr. Thiagarajan	

AUGUST

MON	TUE	WED	TH	FRI
				* 1 Mr. Thiagarajan
4	5	6	7	8 Institutes End

* Days children were available in El Paso

INTRODUCTORY AND ADVANCED INSTITUTES INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM LOG

June 30

I. Institute Organization
   A. Registration
      1. Course
      2. Motor vehicles
   B. Tour of campus facilities
   C. Orientation

July 1

I. Class Organization
   A. Introductory Institute
      1. Pretesting
         a. Learning theory
         b. Programed instruction
   B. Advanced Institute
      1. Pretesting
      2. Preparation of materials for developmental testing

July 2

Consultants: Dr. Susan Markle
Dr. Philip Tieman
Dr. Gilbert Delgado

   A. Slide-Tape presentation to both institutes
      1. Really Understanding Concepts
      2. The Analysis of Concepts
      3. The Analysis of Student Problems
   B. Small group discussion
      1. Follow-up discussion and assignment
      2. Participants analyzed own concepts

July 3

Consultants: Dr. Susan Markle
Dr. Philip Tieman

   A. Presentation to both institutes
      1. Developing Specific Instructional Objectives
      2. Developing Really Specific Instructional Objectives
   B. Small group discussion
      1. Participant development of instructional objectives
   C. Interaction with consultants

July 4

   A. Introductory Institute (Holiday)
   B. Advanced Institute
      1. Preparation of programed materials for developmental testing in El Paso

July 7

   A. Introductory Institute
      1. Operant conditioning
      2. Successive approximation
      3. Superstitious behavior
      4. Conditioning behavior
   B. Advanced Institute
      1. Discussion of The Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Review of Research
      2. Presentation of Project LIFE material by Darryl Cue
      3. Programed Segment: "Developmental Testing"

July 8

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Stimulus discrimination and successive approximation
   2. Writing discrimination frames
   3. Study of semantics
   4. Organization of curriculum material
   5. Additional concept analysis
   6. Statement of objectives

B. Advanced Institute
   1. Field trip to El Paso - Special Classes for Hearing Impaired
   2. Debriefing of visit
   3. Discussion of Entry Behavior Tests
   4. Post test on Developmental Testing

July 9

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Statement of objectives
   2. Analysis of discrimination frames
   3. Overview of 5 basic programing techniques
   4. Discussion of frame writing

B. Advanced Institute
   1. Developmental testing in El Paso
   2. Development of programed materials
   3. Discussion of reinforcement to be used in developmental testing

July 10

Consultants: Dr. Glenn Pfau
Mrs. Hilda Williams

A. Presentations to both institutes
   1. Introduction to Project LIFE
   2. Review of research in deaf education
   3. "Language Development in the Deaf" by Mrs. Williams
   4. Filmstrip and tape: "This Land is Your Land"
   5. Programed instructional system characteristics

B. Project LIFE
   1. Programs available
   2. Programing process
   3. Demonstration of new equipment
   4. Demonstration of new materials

C. Advanced Institute
   1. Development of programed materials
   2. Developmental testing in El Paso

July 11

Consultants: Dr. Glenn Pfau
Mrs. Hilda Williams

A. Introductory Institute
Mrs. Hilda Williams
   1. Problems:
      a. Words and phrases
      b. Program writing
      c. Testing and developmental procedures

B. Advanced Institute
   1. Individual consultation with Dr. Pfau
   2. Mrs. Williams:
      a. Problems in programing for the deaf

b. Demonstration of Project LIFE equipment
c. Using Project LIFE materials

C. Presentation on developmental testing experiences by advanced participants to introductory group

July 14

Consultant: Dr. Phillip Harris

A. Presentation to both institutes
1. Programed tutoring
2. Operational programing
3. Instructional programing
4. Techniques of programed tutoring

B. Introductory Institute
1. Project LIFE material demonstration by Darryl Cue
2. Response analysis techniques

C. Advanced Institute
1. Individual consultation with Dr. Harris
2. Development of programed materials

July 15

Consultant: Dr. Phillip Harris

A. Introductory Institute Presentation: Response analysis systems

B. Advanced Institute
1. Individual consultation with Dr. Harris
2. Developmental testing in El Paso
3. Preparation of programed materials

C. Combined institutes
1. Film: "Communications Primer"
2. Discussion of film

July 16

A. Introductory Institute
1. Review of linear and branching techniques
2. Developmental testing
3. Research evaluation
4. Development of programed materials

B. Advanced Institute
1. Developmental testing in El Paso
2. Development of programed materials

July 17

Consultant: Dr. Ross Stuckless

A. Introductory Institute
1. Review of prompting and cueing
2. Development of programed materials
3. Discussion of ERIC Clearing House

B. Advanced Institute
1. Developmental testing in El Paso
2. Development of programed materials
3. Discussion of language development
4. Devices for monitoring early behavior
5. Dr. Stuckless presentation on Systems

July 18

Consultant: Dr. Ross Stuckless

A. Introductory Institute
1. Dr. Stuckless presentation
a. Systems
b. DIG Relationships (Priorities in content selection)
2. National Technical Institute for the Deaf - developmental activities
3. Development of programed materials

B. Advanced Institute
1. Developmental testing in El Paso
2. Dr. Stuckless presentation
a. Slides of National Technical Institute for the Deaf

July 21

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Evaluation of first half of Institute
   2. Preparation of programed materials
B. Advanced Institute - Holiday in lieu of July 4th

July 22

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Developmental testing in El Paso
   2. Development of programed materials
B. Advanced Institute
   1. Creation of checklists for developing programed materials for the deaf
   2. Outlining specifications of conditions under which behavior is to be exhibited
   3. Development of paired-associate lists for discrimination between "is" and "are" with noun changes
   4. Evaluation of first half of institute

July 23

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Developmental testing in El Paso
   2. Development of programed materials
B. Advanced Institute
   1. "Validation Testing"
   2. Development of programed materials

July 24

Consultant: Dr. Samuel Postlethwait
A. Presentation to both institutes
   1. Introduction to Audio-Tutorial Approach
   2. Film: "The Audio-Tutorial System"
   3. Discussion of Audio-Tutorial System
      a. Effectiveness of system
      b. Cost of system
      c. Designing and developing system
   4. Kodak M-80 projector
      a. Development and demonstration
      b. Integration of projector with A-T system

July 25

Consultant: Dr. Samuel Postlethwait
A. Presentation to both institutes
   1. Applications of Audio-Tutorial System
   2. Innovations in Education
B. Developmental testing in El Paso

July 28

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Discussion of methetics
   2. Development of programed materials
B. Advanced Institute
   1. Discussion of Individually Prescribed Instruction
   2. Film: "Rx for Learning"
   3. Discussion of film
   4. Preparation of programed materials
C. Joint Institute
   1. Film: "Focus on Behavior-Learning About Learning"
   2. Discussion

July 29
Consultant: Dr. Lawrence Stolurow
- A. Introductory Institute
  - 1. Developmental testing in El Paso
  - 2. Development of programed materials
- B. Advanced Institute
  - 1. Dr. Stolurow
    - a. Problems relating to teaching and individualized instruction
    - b. Stimulus, cue, response and elicitor discussion
- C. Joint Institute - Presentation by Dr. Stolurow

July 30
- A. Introductory Institute
  - 1. Developmental testing in El Paso
  - 2. History of response elicitation
  - 3. Prompting sequences and reinforcement
  - 4. Review for final exam
- B. Advanced Institute
  - 1. Systems approach
    - a. Statements of objectives
    - b. Discussion of input, thruput, output
  - 2. Flowcharting

July 31
Consultant: Dr. Sivasailam Thiagarajan
- A. Joint Institute presentation
  - 1. Dr. Thiagarajan
    - a. Human Element in Instructional Systems
    - b. Operational Programing in Tutorial Reading Project
    - c. Demonstration of development of operational programs

August 1
Consultant: Dr. Sivasailam Thiagarajan
- A. Introductory Institute
  - 1. Developmental testing in El Paso
  - 2. Development of programs
- B. Advanced Institute
  - 1. Discussion of pretest, post-test and modified gain score
  - 2. Programing for deaf children
  - 3. Developmental testing techniques for deaf population
  - 4. Individual consultation with Dr. Thiagarajan

August 4
Consultant: Mr. Kay Rigg
- A. Introductory Institute
  - 1. Speech Program at NMSU
  - 2. Contingency Management
  - 3. Development of programed materials
  - 4. Review for final exam
- B. Advanced Institute
  - 1. Flowcharting
  - 2. Flowgraphing and matrices
  - 3. Development of programs

August 5

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Detection of errors through student testing
   2. Checklist for evaluating programed instructional materials

B. Advanced Institute
   1. Systems with memory
   2. Schedules of reinforcement
   3. Ashley's Law of Requisite Variety and its implications for language development
   4. Review of systems approach and analysis
   5. Problems in the application of systems methodology

August 6

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Post-test
   2. Consultation by instructor with participants regarding post-test
   3. Preparation of programed materials for reproduction

B. Advanced Institute
   1. Post-test
   2. Development of instructional flowchart
   3. Preparation of programed materials for reproduction

August 7

A. Introductory Institute
   1. Consultation by instructor with participants regarding post-test
   2. Preparation of programed materials for reproduction

B. Advanced Institute
   1. Flowcharting
   2. Preparation of programed materials for reproduction

August 8

A. Presentation to both Institutes
   1. Film project by Florence Conner
   2. Discussion of film

B. Evaluation
   1. Institutes--final
   2. Instructors

PROGRAMED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS DEVELOPED
by 1968 and 1969 Summer Institutes in Programed Instruction and Instructional Systems

With few exceptions, the programs listed have been developmentally tested with deaf or hard-of-hearing students. They have not been validated on representative samplings of deaf students. Their development is primarily an exercise to learn the concepts, techniques and skills involved in the programing process.

Language Arts

TITLE OF PROGRAM	PROGRAMER(S)
Discrimination Between Past, Present Progressive and Future Verb Forms	G.I. Wilson James and Dorothy McCarr
Recognizing When to Use OR in Sentences	Mary Humphreys
Behind and In Front Of	Clemontine Y. Randall
Expand and Contract	Norman Anderson
Beginning--Middle--End	June E. Newkirk
Before and After (as place words)	June E. Newkirk
Plurals of Words	Mildred S. Zabriskie
Concept of "On and Off"	Gerald W. Pollard
Spelling for Parts of the Body	Kenneth Eberle
An Understanding of In Front of and Beside	Joan Tellam
Bigger and Biggest (concepts)	Leonard Lane
More Than--Fewer Than--Less Than	June E. Newkirk
Between, Beside, and Through	Mattie Box
Parts of the Face	Patricia Hogan
Who and What	G.I. Wilson James McCarr

TITLE OF PROGRAM	PROGRAMER(S)
Under and Over (concepts of)	Joan DeBoer
Concept of "Isness" and "Areness"	Norman Anderson
Concept of Taller and Shorter	Gene Renck
Building Stories with Judy and Jack	Sister Mary Walter
Discrimination Between Nouns and Adjectives	Helen Langstaff
Verbs "To Be and To Have"	Florence Conner
In Front Of, Behind (concepts)	Darryl Cue
Vocabulary Expansion-Spelling	Anthony Papalia
Pronouns	Sister Mary Walter
Prepositions Under and Over	Gloria B. Hunt
Mathematics	
Less Than and Greater Than and Their Symbols	Beverly Young
Identifying Circles, Triangles, Squares and Rectangles	Melissa Scott
Division Contexts	Marvin Wolach
A Method of Changing Decimal Numerals to Fractional Numbers	Robert M. Edwards
New Math--Long Division"Mechanics"	Beverly Young
Key Words in Addition and Subtraction	Verne P. Call
Addition Concepts	Perl H. Dunn
Volume Measurement	Wilson Fonville
Measuring in Points	Ruth P. Davis
Counting Money	Albert J. Heitz
Concepts of Lines and Circles (basic knowledge of)	Suzanne Ladner

TITLE OF PROGRAM	PROGRAMER(S)
Concepts of More and Less	Robert M. Edwards
Social Science	
How to Read a Map	Peter Dinneson
Geographic Characteristics (concepts of)	Franklyn Amann
Determining Electoral College Vote	Richard Hanks
Teaching Names and Spellings of Various Housing Construction Materials	Patricia Davies
How Rocks Change to Soil	Helen R. Sewell
Life Cycle of a Salmon	Lester Graham
Parts of a Flower	Robert Hoover
Discrimination Between Count and Noncount Nouns	(Unknown)
General	
Basic Filing Program	Earle S. Jones
Playing Cards	Malcolm Henderson
Cued Speech	Stanford Rupert
How to Identify and Complete Items on an Application Blank	Glenn Frakes Wilson Fonville
Alphabetizing (for alphabetical filing)	Theodore Beckmeyer
Work in Media Center High School Level	Carole M. Templin
Fingerspelling	Diann Mizell
Concept of Payment of Salary	Bert Sperstad
Use of the Polaroid Land Camera - Model 180	Eliza J. Ray
Installment Buying	Marie C. Lloyd

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

In December, 1968, announcements of the two summer Institutes were mailed to the executive officer of each school or program in the United States which, according to the Directory of Services for the Deaf in the United States, served more than 40 students.

Shortly before that time initial efforts were made to identify prospective faculty for the Institutes. By February, negotiations with the instructors had been completed.

In response to our announcements, approximately 120 applications were requested and 88 were returned. Applications were screened and preliminary evaluations of specific qualifications were made by the Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf staff.

An initial planning meeting was conducted in Chicago, Illinois on February 7, attended by the instructors and the institute director. At this meeting, the general instructional content was discussed and a list of potential guest lecturers was drawn up.

A five member selection committee consisting of representatives of residential, day, private, and parochial programs for the deaf was formed. A committee meeting was held on March 17 at which participants and alternate participants were selected.

Form letters including the names of the selection committee members were sent to each applicant advising him of the selections made. Biographical sketches of all participants were sent to each successful applicant.

Letters were sent to the proposed consultants requesting their assistance and in some cases requesting treatment of specific topics.

Materials discriptive of activities and sites of general interest to visitors in Southern New Mexico were gathered and sent to successful applicants.

Data on housing needs were collected from the participants and with few exceptions, housing accommodations were located by Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf staff. Housing is available on the New Mexico State University campus for persons without children.

Institute facilities were made available by New Mexico State University for instructional purposes through the scheduling office. These proved to be adequate, providing a small auditorium for lectures, two rooms adequate in size for workshops and room for office space for the instructors.

Where requested and flight information was provided, prepaid airline tickets were sent to participants by the Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf and transportation from El Paso to Las Cruces was provided.

Arrangements for registration with the University were made. Arrangements were also made for orientation to the New Mexico State University Library.

Samples of commercial programed instructional materials were purchased.

On the first day of the institute, a social committee and a feedback committee were formed. Student assistant help was made available to assist the social committee as necessary.

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

Planning

Prior to the institutes, a list was made of possible social activities to be held during the institute. These included picnics, sight seeing tours and a banquet. Prices for these activities were calculated in order to estimate the approximate per capita cost of social activities for the entire institute.

Social Committee

On the first day of the institute a social committee was formed. This committee consisisted of five participants. Three were members of the advanced institute. This committee was given the responsibility of soliciting suggestions for social activities from the other participants.

Committee Meetings

At the first committee meeting all of the pre-planned alternatives were presented for the committee's consideration. The suggestions submitted to the committee members by the other participants were also considered. From these suggestions, the committee formulated a tentative calendar of events with the approximate costs. It was decided that a $15.00 assessment would be made against all adults that planned to attend every function. For adults that planned to attend only a portion of the activities, a pro-rated amount was determined. This money was collected by the social chairman and deposited in a local bank for the payment of all bills approved by the social committee.

Planned Activities

The following activities were planned and carried out.

1. Sight-seeing tour of Juarez, Mexico on July 12, 1969.
2. White Sands picnic on July 18, 1969.
3. White Sands picnic on July 29, 1969.
4. Banquet at the Palms Hotel on August 6, 1969.

Miscellaneous expenses were also paid from the assessment. These included:

1. A coffee hour during the first week of the institute.
2. Group pictures of the members of the institute.
3. Meals for the guest lecturers.

At the end of the institutes, the balance in the social activity fund was returned to the participants on a pro-rata basis.

SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

EVALUATION

Institute evaluation by participants was obtained through forms distributed to them at the completion of the third week of study and at the completion of the institute.

The following is a compilation of the responses obtained from these forms. Participants did not always respond to each statement. This accounts for the difference in total responses for some items.

In addition, pretests of entry knowledge level were given. Grades were assigned partially based on pre-post test gain scores. The test items are not included in this report.

A feedback committee was established to facilitate communication from participants to staff and faculty.

Consultants evaluation forms were completed after each guest lecturer's presentation. Original copies of the forms were forwarded to the guest lecturer.

Included in this report are the following:

1. Evaluation of institute instructors; specimen form.
2. Evaluation of guest lecturers; specimen form.
3. Summary of participant evaluations at end of third week; Introductory and Advanced Institutes combined.
4. Summary of participant final evaluation; responses to Introductory and Advanced Institutes.

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF INSTITUTE AT END OF THIRD WEEK

Introductory Institute

1. I FIND THAT THE MATERIAL IS BEING PRESENTED

   4 too quickly 20 at proper pace 2 too slowly

2. I WOULD LIKE MORE 3 lecturing 8 individual work

   4 class discussion 3 private conferences 5 other

3. I WOULD LIKE LESS 5 lecturing 0 individual work

   2 class discussion 0 private conference work

   3 irrelevant lectures

4. THE HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS ARE (TOO)

   0 lengthy 3 short 2 vague 0 structured 17 just right

5. I FEEL THAT DEVELOPING A PROGRAM WILL BE OR IS

   0 easy 12 difficult 0 impossible 13 time-consuming

   21 rewarding to me

6. I WOULD LIKE MORE PRACTICE IN WRITING

   17 frames 23 sequences 10 operational objectives

7. I WOULD LIKE MORE OCCASIONS ON WHICH

   6 I am told what to do 7 I decide what I need to study

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS MADE BY PARTICIPANTS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. Evaluate other published programs
2. Group work on programs
3. Opportunity to work with a larger deaf population
4. The institute was well planned

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF INSTITUTE AT END OF THIRD WEEK

Advanced Institute

1. I FIND THAT THE MATERIAL IS BEING PRESENTED

   0 too quickly 10 at proper pace 1 too slowly

2. I WOULD LIKE MORE 2 lecturing 1 individual work

   4 class discussion 0 private conference work 0 other

3. I WOULD LIKE LESS 0 lecturing 3 individual work

   0 class discussion 0 private conference work 0 other

4. THE HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS ARE (TOO)

   0 lengthy 0 short 1 vague 0 structured 11 just right

5. I FEEL THAT DEVELOPING A PROGRAM WILL BE OR IS

   0 easy 7 difficult 0 impossible 1 time-consuming

   11 rewarding to me

6. I WOULD LIKE MORE PRACTICE IN WRITING

   1 frames 4 sequences 5 operational objectives

7. I WOULD LIKE MORE OCCASIONS ON WHICH

   3 I am told what to do 3 I decide what I need to study

SUMMARY OF FINAL

INSTITUTE EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

Introductory Institute responses are above the line; Advanced Institute responses are below the line.

Key to Summary:

Response headings used as follows:

A = very good B = good C = adequate

D = inadequate E = very inadequate

F = no opinion (not recorded)

Directions: Check one response only.

1. Objectives

	A	B	C	D	E	F
a) The degree to which the Institute helped me was:	22	5	2			
	8	3				
b) My understanding of the objectives of the Institute prior to the beginning of the program was:	3	5	6	10	5	
	3	3	3	3		
c) As a method for improving teacher competence and knowledge, the Institute program was:	24	5				
	12					

2. Organization and Administration	Too much	Too little	Adequate
a) The degree to which the schedule allowed for discussion with staff and other participants outside the formal program was:		2	27
		1	10
	Too large	Too small	Adequate
b) The size of your group in the Institute was:	8		21
			11

	A	B	C	D	E	F
c) The classroom facilities were:	7	13	6	2		
	3	3	4	1		
d) The library facilities were:	6	4	9	5	1	
	1		3	2		
e) The library personnel were:	1	3	12	2	2	
	1	1	3	1		
f) Time allowed for recreation was:	15	7	6			
	6	3	2			
g) Time alloted for social activities was:	15	7	7			
	7	2	2			
h) The recreational facilities available were:	9	11	8	1		
	6	3	1	1		
i) The opportunities for social and cultural activities were:	11	9	6	2		
	3	5	3			

j) Should the total length of the Institute period or week, or day be changed?

___Yes ___No If yes, how?

(Comments are not recorded in this summary.)

3. Instruction and Staff	A	B	C	D	E	F
a) The extent to which the Institute met my expectations in the overall content of lectures and other activities was:	15	9	3		1	
	4	5	1	1		
b) In comparison to previous educational programs in which I have participated, the quantity of instruction was:	17	6	2	1		
	5	5	1			
c) The balance maintained by the Institute program between theory and practice was:	12	8	4	4		
	2	9				
d) Learning that resulted from practicum activities was:	15	9	3	1		
	5	6				
e) The extent to which the outside speakers were integrated into the total program was:	4	9	8	5	3	
	1	8	2			
f) The ratio of instructors to participants was:	10	4	10	4		
	6	4				
g) The interaction among participants was:	12	8	5	2		
	10	1				

	Too much	Too little	Adequate
h) Opportunity to communicate with staff			29
			11

	A	B	C	D	E	F
i) The degree to which the Institute provided opportunity to become acquainted with recent professional literature in the field of programed learning was:	7	12	7	2	1	
	2	5	2	2		

4. Effects on Participants	A	B	C	D	E	F
a) The extent to which the Institute was instrumental in clarifying my own perception regarding the need for using programed materials at my level was:	17	10	1	1		
	7	3	1			
b) As a result of the Institute my confidence in using these new ideas is:	10	17	1			
	9	2				
c) The challenge to my intellectual capacities during the Institute program was:	19	7	3			
	9	1	1			
d) I feel my ability to motivate students, lead them to voluntary efforts, and encourage them to set higher standards for themselves will, as a result of the program be:	14	14	1			
	7	1	3			
e) The extent to which the Institute developed my ability to organize teaching materials was:	16	10	2	1		
	7	2	2			
f) The degree to which the Institute increased my desire to try new teaching methods was:	25	3	1			
	7	4				

Assume that you are designing a course with the same general objectives as this Institute.

What percentage of time would you allocate to each of the following activities?

(If you do not want to use one of the activities at all, give it 0%. Make sure that your percentages add up to 100%.)

1.	Working through programed material on programing theory.	10.1 7.2
2.	Working through programed material on practical programing techniques.	9.8 8.9
3.	Lectures on psychological principles of programed instruction.	12.4 6.7
4.	Lectures on practical programing techniques.	14.3 8.1
5.	Reading nonprogramed textbooks on basic principles of programed instruction.	3.8 1.6
6.	Reading nonprogramed textbooks on practical programing.	4.1 2.2
7.	Individual design and development of programed units.	24.1 33.9
8.	Individual editorial consultation with instructor.	11.4 13.0
9.	Developmental testing of student-developed programs.	10.5 18.2

Responses to the following open-ended questions tended to be specific. Responses were tabulated and categorized as closely as possible to the sentiment expressed by the participants.

Please respond to each of the following questions.

1. THE ONE GREATEST STRENGTH OF THE INSTITUTE WAS -

Introductory Institute

a. Relaxed, stimulating, productive atmosphere - 10
b. Instructors' knowledge - 7
c. Practical application of theory - 3
d. Enthusiasm generated - 3
e. Writing programs - 2
f. Detail in P.I. - 2
g. Emphasis on organization - 2
h. Interaction - 1
i. Learning how behavioral objectives relate to education - 1
j. The staff - 1

Advanced Institute

a. Chance for interaction - 6
b. Developing programs - 3
c. Developmental testing - 2

2. THE ONE MAJOR WEAKNESS OF THE INSTITUTE WAS -

Introductory Institute

a. Some guest lecturers were not adequate - 7
b. Student population - 5
c. Insufficient testing time - 2
d. Too many preliminary activities - 2
e. Lack of direction - 1
f. Technical language - 1
g. Lack of P.I. machines - 1
h. No activities for spouses - 1
i. Not enough emphasis on deaf education - 1
j. Organization - 1
k. Not enough outside work - 1
l. Lack of communication with Media Center - 1
m. Not enough communication before institute - 1
n. Lack of text books - 1
o. Too much lecturing - 1

Advanced Institute

a. Children not adequate - 2
b. Organization - 2
c. Inadequate coverage of systems - 2
d. Inadequate time to develop programs - 2
e. Media Specialist absent - 1
f. Scheduling of lecturers - 1

3. THE MOST SIGNIFICANT THING THAT HAPPENED TO ME DURING THE INSTITUTE WAS -

Introductory Institute

a. Learning how to program - 9
b. Realization I had not been teaching to the best of my ability - 5
c. Learning to state behavioral objectives - 4
d. Discovering how P.I. relates to deaf education - 5
e. Making new friends - 2
f. Sharing programs - 1
g. Renewed hope for deaf education - 1
h. Hearing Dr. Postlethwait - 1

Advanced Institute

a. The exposure to so many ideas - 4
b. Being able to program - 2
c. A greater insight into teaching - 1
d. Writing objectives - 1
e. Pre and post test techniques - 1
f. Developmental testing - 1
g. Feedback - 1

4. IF I COULD ATTEND A SIMILAR INSTITUTE, I WOULD SUGGEST -

Introductory Institute

a. More general information before Institute - 7
b. Do more programing - 5
c. Hold in different location - 2
d. More graphic illustrations of programing techniques - 2
e. Smaller class - 1
f. Fewer lectures - 2
g. All educational activities in one location - 1
h. Demonstration of more P.I. machines - 1
i. Better sample of students - 1
j. More group evaluations of programs - 1
k. Better access to students - 1
l. More outside work - 1
m. Better selection of consultants - 1
n. More emphasis on cultural, social and recreational activities - 1

Advanced Institute

a. More children and closer at hand - 5
b. More program writing - 2
c. Hold on campus of school for deaf - 2
d. More time for developing programs - 2
e. More information before Institute - 2
f. Consultants stay longer - 1
g. More typical deaf children - 1
h. Fewer lectures - 1
i. Participants should have similar fields - 1
j. Consultants earlier in program - 1

5. IF YOU WISH, REMARK ON THE EL PASO STUDENTS AVAILABLE FOR DEVELOPMENTAL TESTING.

Introductory Institute

a. Not representative - 8
b. Inadequate - 5
c. Lack of advanced students - 3
d. Range too wide - 2
e. Adequate - 2
f. Too few - 1
g. To far away - 1
h. Not enough knowledge about children before tested - 1

Advanced Institute

a. Too few - 5
b. Unsatisfactory - 4
c. Not typical - 4
d. Range not broad enough - 2
e. Children were polite and helpful - 2

6. WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU SUGGEST ON THE WAY THE INSTITUTE WAS CONDUCTED?

Introductory Institute

a. Cancel certain guest lecturers - 4
b. No changes - 4
c. Shorter lectures - 2
d. Have less non-directed classtime - 2
e. Need more direction - 1
f. Group participants according to grade level - 1
g. Have students in Las Cruces - 1
h. More work on solving practical problems - 1
i. Better use of 3rd instructor - 1
j. Better scheduling of guest lecturers - 1
k. More lab work - 1
l. More involvement of participants - 1
m. Information about guest lecturers presentation - 1
n. Guest lecturers should relate more to introductory group - 1

Advanced Institute

a. Sufficient time to develop programs - 2
b. More developmental testing-2
c. Hold on a campus for the deaf - 1
d. Better organization - 1
e. Advance notice of objectives - 1
f. Less emphasis on systems - 1
g. Change location - 1
h. Wider student population-1
i. None - 1

7. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION IS A TECHNIQUE THAT SHOULD BE EXTENSIVELY USED AS ONE METHOD OF MEETING THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF DEAF CHILDREN?

Introductory Institute

a. Yes - 27
b. As a supplementary method only - 3

Advanced Institute

a. Yes - 10
b. No - 1

IF YES, DO YOU BELIEVE YOUR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IS ADEQUATELY INFORMED AND DISPOSED TO IMPLEMENT THE USE OF P.I. IN YOUR SCHOOL?

Introductory Institute

a. No - 16
b. Yes - 13

Advanced Institute

a. No - 4
b. Yes - 4
c. Just the ones in institute

IF NO, LIST SEVERAL TYPES OF EXPERIENCES OR INFORMATION THAT YOU BELIEVE YOUR ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD HAVE IN ORDER TO ENABLE THEM TO IMPLEMENT THE USE OF P.I. MATERIALS.

Introductory Institute

a. Hold institute for administrators - 4
b. Hold workshops for administrators - 4
c. Have administrators actually program - 4
d. Value of programing - 2
e. In-service training for administrators - 1
f. Value of released time for teachers - 1
g. Information about behavioral objectives - 2
h. Share programs with administrators - 1
i. Have them observe children working with programs - 1
j. Technical aspects of programing - 1
k. Knowledge of equipment - 1
l. The philosophy of P.I.

Advanced Institute

a. Include them in an institute - 2
b. Hold workshops - 2
c. Information on objectives - 1
d. Value of programing - 1
e. Value of released time - 1
f. Value of individualized work - 1
g. Share programs with administrators - 1
h. Participants should spread the word - 1

8. WHAT WAS YOUR PRIMARY REASON FOR ENROLLING IN THIS COURSE?

Introductory Institute

a. To learn about P.I. - 21
b. To become a better teacher - 5
c. Professional improvement - 2
d. Job assignment - 1

Advanced Institute

a. To gain more knowledge about P.I. - 8
b. To be a better teacher - 3

WHAT WERE YOUR SECONDARY REASONS?

Introductory Institute

a. To visit the Southwest - 6
b. To make new acquaintences - 6
c. To keep up with modern trends - 3
d. Pay - 2
e. Course credit - 2
f. To learn about P.I. - 1
g. Employer suggestions - 1
h. Enjoy school - 1
i. No secondary reasons - 8

Advanced Institute

a. Improve teaching techniques - 2
b. To determine if P.I. was applicable to my field - 2
c. To meet new people - 1
d. Additional college credit-1
e. Was encouraged by employer - 1
f. To develop a skill - 1
g. Money - 1
h. None - 1

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION FORM

INSTITUTES ON PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS

_____Introductory _____Advanced

Please place an initial in ONE of the blanks for each instructor.

Instructor A Instructor B Instructor C

KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER

___Exceedingly well informed
___Adequately informed
___Not well informed
___Very poorly informed

ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT

___Enthusiastic
___Rather interested
___Routine interest
___Uninterested

ABILITY TO EXPLAIN

___Clear and to the point
___Usually adequate
___Often adequate
___Totally inadequate

SPEAKING ABILITY

___Excellent
___Satisfactory
___Adequate
___Poor

ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS

___Very helpful, understanding
___Sympathetic, interested
___Routine, neutral
___Distant, cold, aloof

PERSONALITY

___Very attractive
___Satisfactory
___Neutral
___Conflicting

OVERALL RATING OF INSTRUCTOR

___Outstanding
___Better than average
___Average
___Below average
___Poor

CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM

INSTITUTES ON PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONAL SYSTEMS

_____Introductory _____Advanced
(please check one)

Please place an "X" on ONE of the blanks for each category.
Write comments on reverse side of sheet.

KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT MATTER

___Exceedingly well informed
___Adequately informed
___Not well informed
___Very poorly informed

ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT

___Enthusiastic
___Rather interested
___Routine interest
___Uninterested

ABILITY TO EXPLAIN

___Clear and to the point
___Usually adequate
___Often adequate
___Totally inadequate

SPEAKING ABILITY

___Excellent
___Satisfactory
___Adequate
___Poor

ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENTS

___Very helpful, understanding
___Sympathetic, interested
___Routine, neutral
___Distant, cold, aloof

PERSONALITY

___Very attractive
___Satisfactory
___Neutral
___Conflicting

OVERALL RATING OF CONSULTANT

___Outstanding
___Better than average
___Average
___Below average
___Poor

ORGANIZATION OF PRESENTATION

___Well organized
___Adequate, but could be better
___Inadequate, distracting
___Confused, unsystematic

OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION

___Ample
___Occasional
___Too infrequent
___None

CONTINUITY WITH INSTITUTE

___Well suited
___Somewhat appropriate
___Neutral
___Very inappropriate

LEVEL OF PRESENTATION

___Suited to participants
___Completely above participants
___Completely below participants
___Attempted to suit participants

VALUE OF PRESENTATION

___Very useful
___Somewhat useful
___Of little value
___Worthless

CONSULTANT EVALUATION FORM

METHOD OF PRESENTATION

___Ingenious, creative
___Interesting, held attention
___Monotonous, dull
___Uninteresting, boring

OVERALL RATING OF PRESENTATION

___Outstanding
___Better than average
___Average
___Below average
___Poor

RECOMMENDATIONS

While the Southwest Regional Media Center for the Deaf staff feels a great deal of satisfaction regarding the institutes, the following instructional and administrative recommendations seem in order.

1. If possible, admission to the advanced institute should be contingent upon previous attendance in the introductory institute.

2. Advanced participants should be advised to bring programed materials which they can use for developmental testing.

3. Before and during the preliminary planning meeting, the instructors and institute director should develop a statement of objectives and a general course outline to be disseminated to participants before the institute.

4. A reasonable reading list, including programed materials on programing should be sent to the institute participants for completion before arrival.

5. A thorough study of information required from participants should be made to simplify and consolidate forms to be completed by applicants and participants.

6. A full time Media Specialist should be available for the duration of the institute to assist the participants and the instructional staff.

7. More adequate provisions should be made for duplication and dissemination of materials developed by institute participants.

8. The stipend position should be redistributed resulting in 28 positions for the introductory institute and 14 positions in the advanced institute.

9. Consideration should be given to methods of providing a more representative sampling of deaf students for use by participants in developmental testing.

10. Guest lecturers should be contacted as early as possible, and should be advised of course content and progression in order that their presentations be better integrated.

11. Guest lecturers should not be engaged for the first week of the institute.

12. Biographical and professional information regarding each guest lecturer should be distributed to participants prior to his presentation.

13. Fewer guest lecturers should be engaged and the average time for each consultant should be increased.

14. Participant evaluation of guest lecturers should be considered in making future selections.

15. Planning should continue to include a social and a feedback committee.

16. Social activities should be planned for the wives of instructors and participants.

ROSTER AND ADDRESSES OF STAFF, INSTRUCTORS AND PARTICIPANTS

Staff

Marshall S. Hester
Project Director
Southwest Regional Media Center
for the Deaf
P.O. Box 3AW
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Hubert D. Summers
Institute Director
Southwest Regional Media Center
for the Deaf
P.O. Box 3AW
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Instructors

Arthur Babick - Advanced Institute
910 South Manor
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Bernard Basescu - Introductory Institute
201 W. 89th Street
New York, New York 10024

James Russell - Assistant Instructor to Introductory and Advanced Institutes
2424 Marlane Avenue
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Participants

Franklin Amann
3101 75th Avenue., #204
Landover, Maryland 20785

Norman Anderson
Wyoming School for the Deaf
Casper, Wyoming 82601

Mattie Box
1306 Elizabeth Boulevard
Fort Worth, Texas 76110

Verne Call
6408 Los Santos Drive
Long Beach, California

Eugene Catalano
Box 799
Portland, Maine 04104

Sister Mary Claude
St. John's School for the Deaf
3680 S. Kinnickinnic Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53207

Florence Conner
2345 East 2nd Street
Tucson, Arizona 85719

Darryl Cue
4907 Manitoba Drive, Apt.T-3
Alexandria, Virginia 22312

Patricia Davies
1630 "M" Street
Gering, Nebraska 69341

Clarence Davis
1211 Westminster Ave.
Fulton, Missouri 65251

Ruth Davis
265 Sumac Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Joann DeBoer
31008 Champine Drive
St. Clair Shores, Michigan 48282

Peter Dinnesen
11497 Fiesta Court
Cincinnati, Ohio 45240

Perl L. Dunn
1615 York Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55102

Kenneth Eberle
136 Bartlett Avenue
Sharon Hill, Pennsylvania

Robert Edwards
2135 Carlyle Drive
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Roster of Participants, continued

JoAnn Ezan
5998 N. Manton Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60646

Wilson Fonville
2932 Garden Hill Drive
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80904

Lester Graham
106 Solana Drive
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Richard Hanks
1909 Plum
Jacksonville, Illinois 62650

Albert Heitz
1720 Glendale-Milford Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45215

Patricia Hogan
Beresford Park School
Deaf & Hard of Hearing Program
300 28th Avenue
S. San Mateo, California

Robert Hoover
% Texas School for the Deaf
1102 S. Congress Ave.
Austin, Texas

Gloria Hunt
289 Ulua Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96821

Suzanne Ladner
P.O. Box 799
Portland,Maine 04104

Leonard Lane
5803 Fisher Rd., Apt.101
Temple Hills, Maryland 20031

Helen Langstaff
400 S. Berendo St., #202
Los Angeles, California 90005

Marie Lloyd
413 W. 39th
Vancouver, Washington 98660

James and Dorothy McCarr
1253 Karen Way, N.W.
Salem, Oregon 97304

Diann Mizell
601 S. Madison
Madison Elementary
Hinsdale, Illinois 605[illegible]

June E. Newkirk
1920 Copper Street
Tucson, Arizona 85719

Anthony Papalia
7802 N.E. 12th Street, #99
Vancouver, Washington 98664

Gerald Pollard
6511 Dana Street
Oakland, California

Eliza Jane Ray
Route 4, Box 305F
Wilson, North Carolina 27893

Gene Renck
825 N. Glenhaven Avenue
Fullerton, California 92632

Ramon Rodriguez
Southwest Regional Media Center
for the Deaf
P.O. Box 3AW
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Helen Sewell
4609 Raintree Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78745

Bert Sperstad
2024 Raymond
Dearborn, Michigan 48124

Joan Tellam
1017 E. Blacklidge
Tucson, Arizona 85719

Carole Templin
606 Sandusky Street
Jacksonville, Illinois 62650

Roster of Participants, continued

Sister Mary Walter
St. John's School for the Deaf
3680 S. Kinnickinnic Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53207

G.I. Wilson
999 Locust N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97303

Beverly Young
2917 Hawthorne, #210
Dallas, Texas 75219

Mildred Zabriskie
735-15th Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 96816

Louise Coleman (Interpretor)
3025 Wheeling Avenue
El Paso, Texas 79930

Ann Sleep (Interpretor)
Route 2
Box 312
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Staff Assistants

Terry Horton
1606 Cole Village
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Graydon May
1520 East Wyoming
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Kathie Leyendecker
919 S. Solano, #8
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

1969 SWRMC SUMMER INSTITUTES

O = Schools represented at the 1968 Institute

X = Schools represented at the ~~1968~~ 1969 Institute